

HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 51

Saturday, December 17, 1955

Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

The Issue Today: Whether or not the President will take himself out of the 1956 race, what is the true state of his health, whether the Palace Guard will succeed in its "holding strategy" of delaying the Presidential decision until spring, whether Senator Knowland will formally announce his candidacy — these are the burning questions which have ignited discussions all over Washington in the past 48 hours.

Because of party loyalty, few frank remarks from Republicans get into the press and because of bitter factionalism, few get down to fundamentals and clearly state the real issue which puts up to Republicans (who in the past week feel in their bones that they are approaching a crisis) the alternatives of going on to victory or perishing as a party.

Hence, HUMAN EVENTS reprints below an analysis by a Republican member of Congress, who almost said it publicly, but who — because of party complexities in his home situation — gave it to us, "not for attribution." This is the way our Republican sees it:

The reports on President Eisenhower's physical condition have been directed so far to the question whether his health will permit him to campaign for the Presidency in 1956.

There are increasing protests on Capitol Hill, not loud but deep, that that is not the problem at all. The issue — in 1956 as in 1944 — is whether the President will be well enough to carry the heaviest strain that can be imposed on an American president, in the critical years from 1956 to 1960. Will President Eisenhower be well enough to make the fateful decisions if we have another Pearl Harbor, if he must choose whether or not to release a nuclear bomb, or if he must make an infinite number of delicate choices in the increasingly cold "cold war?"

In the critical year 1944, President Roosevelt had no difficulty in taking his pre-arranged part in a carefully stage-managed campaign. His difficulties arose in a conference like Yalta, of which we still know too little officially. At any rate, many Democrats claim that the state of his health caused Roosevelt to make the mistakes in shaping the peace which was no peace.

Normal sympathy with a sick man would lead most people to wish him complete relief from the burden of the Presidency. As Mr. Eisenhower insists, there is no truth in the assertion that the Republican Party has only one man capable of acting as President or of winning an election. The only agency seeking to entice a reluctant president to lead a reluctant party is the Palace Guard and its guides and mentors, the internationalists. Their tactics in creating an artificial scarcity of candidates are only too reminiscent of the way Harry Hopkins (and Frankfurter, *et al*), the "bathrobe club," removed Paul McNutt, Frank Murphy, Garner, Farley and other potential candidates in 1940.

These are tactics reminiscent of the monarchies of Europe — tactics traditionally played by what were called the "mayors of the Palace" (*los mayores de la palacio*). Today, here in America, these tactics raise not an issue of personalities, but a Constitutional issue. The American presidency is meant to be responsive to the free choice of the voters; the American two-party system is properly directed by the active voters, all the citizens who are willing to take part in politics. Neither is supposed to be directed by government officials, and certainly not by non-elected officials who wish to perpetuate themselves in power.

An elite-controlled government is the European autocratic State, whatever its outward form. The office-holders, the columnists and the international-

ists in the business world or in the huge tax-free foundations, who insist that all Republican candidates keep silent until the Leader decides, are beating the drums for the Rooseveltian state, managed by an elite who know what is good for the people whether the people like it or not.

In short, it all boils down to this — the real issue confronting us today: Those who, like Senators Knowland and Bridges, insist the people must be free to choose by January 15, in time for the primaries, the man they want to lead them during the next four years, are fighting — not for personal advantage, as is so unworthily suggested — but for the constitutional right of the American people to choose officials who will submit to the electoral verdict instead of yielding to the permanent rule of non-elected “mayors of the palace.”

What To Do About It: After members of Congress met with the President this week, many conferred privately — not the least of whom were the conservative Republicans. Some of the latter privately hailed the stand of Knowland (only intimated publicly, but known to be his firm private view and intentions) that the President should announce his plans in January, that unless the President did so, Republican candidates should feel free to throw their hats in the ring.

One factor, stimulating this movement, was the unexpected editorial position of the *Washington Post*, regarded as a “liberal Republican” paper and supporter of President Eisenhower. That paper on December 13 came out flatly agreeing with Knowland’s view. This newspaper, which has often disagreed with Mr. Knowland on matters of policy, declares that “he is right in these circumstances.” And it voices the opinion of an increasing number of people when it said: “If Mr. Eisenhower will not or cannot run again, other Republican candidates for the nomination deserve a fair chance to present their qualifications to the public.”

Both Knowland and Bridges have said enough publicly to establish the pattern to be followed. More GOP members of Congress would follow suit — it is believed — were it not for timidity. If they felt that constituents would approve, many

would make public their views, according to political experts in the Capital. In short, grass-roots pressure might well serve to precipitate matters.

Recognizing this, various organizations are contemplating letter-writing campaigns. “We The People” (111 N. Wabash Ave., Chicago 2, Ill.) plans to call on its members to write letters to Senator Bridges urging him to file for “favorite son” candidate in New Hampshire, and then to follow up by urging conservative Senators in other states to file as favorite sons in their bailiwicks. “For America” (1001 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.) reports planning a somewhat similar appeal to its members. Others urge that citizens write GOP Senators asking them to publicly support the stand of Knowland and Bridges. A round-robin declaration by a number of GOP members of the Upper House, expressing such support, signed by most of the Republican Senators, might well have decisive effect.

Those on Capitol Hill who are familiar with the procedures of politics are convinced that such political action — from the grass-roots to members of Congress and thence to the whole body politic — would have historic repercussions.

What You Can Do Now: Conservative individuals and organizations should write (and urge others to write) Senator Styles Bridges, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. to seek the favorite son designation from New Hampshire on an “if Ike doesn’t run” basis. Encourage other conservative Senators to back Knowland’s stand and run as favorite sons in their states.

Send copies of this issue to friends suggesting that the latter should write their Senators. A coalition of conservative-controlled delegations can foil the Palace Guard plot to nominate Dewey or Warren if Ike doesn’t run.

Lausche: The famous Democratic governor of Ohio has announced his candidacy for “favorite son” nomination in the 1956 Democratic presidential Ohio primaries. Observers in Washington believe this the most important development in the race so far. Lausche, alone of the Democratic hopefuls, is a conservative and has long been an

opponent of "labor bossism." He voted for Taft, a Republican, in 1950 (for Senatorship) against the candidate of his own party. He has a large backing among Taft Republicans.

The fact that he files as a "favorite son" by no means necessarily limits the scope of his role in the campaign or in the convention hall, although he says he has no present plans to campaign outside his state. It is pointed out that, in a number of other states, his name — or a slate pledged to him — can be entered for the presidential nomination without his consent. It is recalled that Warren G. Harding ran in the GOP race for presidential nomination from Ohio in 1920 as a favorite son, registering only sixth among contenders on the first ballot at the convention.

Lausche looms as a portent — to both Democrats and Republicans. If the former turn him down (which today is regarded as likely, due to the opposition of the labor bosses) such an outcome may have a highly unfavorable reaction among Catholic voters and voters of foreign extraction, who compose the backbone of the Democratic Party in the northern big-city states. Lausche, of Slovene parentage, is a Roman Catholic. But, if Lausche should win the Democratic nomination, he would prove a most dangerous antagonist to the GOP candidate, especially if the latter were a "liberal." For, it is recalled, Lausche ran for and won the governorship of Ohio the last three times when his GOP opponents were "liberal" or received the unofficial endorsement of organized labor.

Australian Election: Socialists the world over have been depressed by the results of the Australian elections a week ago. Premier Menzies, of the Conservative Party, representing a coalition of the Conservative and Agrarian Parties, increased his majority and won by what the press called a landslide victory.

The Socialists, who (via coalitions) ruled Australia for many years before Menzies' first

victory in 1949, thought they were about to resume their place as the country's dominant party. Their campaign was built around a program of promising to soak the rich and to increase benefits to the poor. The tax on profits was to be hiked, individual exemptions in the personal income tax were to be increased and the "baby bonuses" were to be doubled in some cases. Menzies based his case on the booming prosperity of the years since he became premier, and dwelt heavily upon the Labor Party's softness toward Communism.

Labor: The Los Angeles tile setters union requires employers to pay journeymen and helpers, working in the San Fernando Valley and other outlying districts, \$2 a day in tax-free "travel pay" in addition to the daily wage of about \$30. The theory behind the travel pay is that these real estate tracts are so "new" that there are no tile setters or helpers in the vicinity. However, under penalty of picketing — which means that no union members in any trade would dare cross the picket line — employers must pay the \$2 per day to workers brought to the tract in employer-owned trucks, and even to those who live only two or three blocks away. Now the tax-free travel "benefit" is rapidly spreading to other unions and other cities.

What Price Benson: Farm prices dropped 35 per cent in 29 months (March, 1937 to August, 1939) during Roosevelt's second term. They had two sharp declines under Truman; 22 per cent in 24 months (January, 1948 — January, 1950) before the Korean war and 16 per cent in 21 months (March, 1951 to December, 1952). The drop under Eisenhower (January, 1953 to October, 1955) has been 13 per cent in 32 months. (Figures from a *Chicago Tribune* "graphic editorial.")

Commented a farm state Republican Congressman who fears defeat in 1956: "If Roosevelt or Truman held as advantageous a comparison as Eisenhower has, they would have told it a score of times on radio or television — directly to the people. But Eisenhower — even before his heart attack — refused to take these facts to the American people because he doesn't want to make any Democrats mad at him. So he builds up his personal popularity — at the expense of the Republican Party!"

Letter from COLA G. PARKER, newly elected President of the National Association of Manufacturers: "As a subscriber to and reader of HUMAN EVENTS practically since its inception, it is for me 'must reading.' It is factual, penetrating, and above all, honest."

Ford Foundation: Among the public relations brethren — a numerous class in the Capital — Ford's magnificent grant to education and health of half a billion dollars was judged a shrewd — but not so novel — move to wipe out trouble by playing Santa Claus. These folks remark that it is no minimization of Henry Ford, Jr.'s generosity to look at some realistic background. After all, these gentlemen are familiar with moves to erase bad news by giving good news to the press — one of the old tricks of their trade.

The fact is that Ford — from the public relations standpoint — has been in trouble for some months. The Fund for the Republic (provided with money from the Ford Foundation) has won wide distrust for its leftist slanted treatment of the civil liberties issue and this misuse of funds has aroused country-wide criticism. As a consequence, Ford unpopularity rose to a stage where their company executives had to face loss of business by boycott.

Henry Ford II issued a statement several weeks ago deploring the way the Foundation's grant had been misused, naturally pointing out that the Ford Foundation had simply donated funds but had no responsibility for the way they were utilized. Still the resultant posture of Ford was — public relations-wise — not exactly strong. At best, the Ford interests were revealed as innocent dupes.

Hence, "Ford did a Rockefeller," as the saying goes among the publicity sages. Ford, they (or his advisers) say, reached back to the turn of the century for a guide — and it was Rockefeller's experience which served to light the way. Rather, it was Ivy Lee, the famous public relations counsellor who was credited with advising Rockefeller to rehabilitate his reputation among the people by philanthropy. For in those days, Rockefeller and his Standard Oil had become fighting words in American politics, due to his role in the great growth of trusts and the ensuing fight against "combinations in restraint of trade" by progressive political forces in the country. That's an old, outworn political story. But the memory of the strategy designed by Ivy Lee for Rockefeller is verdant, because over

the years it apparently rehabilitated the Rockefeller name and reputation.

Another comment on the matter is prevalent and is expressed in a wire to HUMAN EVENTS from Roger Milliken, of South Carolina, one of the largest textile manufacturers in the country. Milliken says: "This gift was made possible by the individual efforts and accomplishments of one man, namely, Henry Ford, Sr. To me this gift was dramatic evidence of what can be accomplished under the system of free enterprise and a living refutation of the fact that we must look to Big Government to help us solve all of our problems. Henry Ford II is unquestionably entitled to congratulations for the splendid way in which the foundation under his leadership has divided up this tremendous gift for the most worthy purposes. But doesn't the greatest recognition belong to Henry, Sr., whose vision and pioneering created the company, whose earnings made this gift possible?"

PRE-PUBLICATION price (until December 31, only) on 1955 BOUND ANNUAL VOLUME with complete index, \$7.50. After January 1, \$15.

In The South: Hodding Carter, the well-known Greenville, Mississippi editor, spends three months every summer in the North. This year when he got back home, he was alarmed at the deterioration in relations between the white and Negro races that had taken place during his short absence. His article, "Racial Tension in the Deep South" tells the story in the December 17, 1955, *Saturday Evening Post*. After reading it, you will be eager to read in an early issue of HUMAN EVENTS an article by James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond, Virginia, *News-Leader*, on a probable course of southern action on school integration.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for \$1.

Pre-publication price (only until December 31) on 1955 BOUND ANNUAL VOLUME with complete index, \$7.50. After January 1, \$15. A few 1954 Bound Volumes are available at \$15.

Yearly rate, \$10; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3. By first class mail, \$11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, \$12 a year; airmail, \$18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

Article Section

ADESTE FIDELES

By E. MERRILL ROOT

AROUND THE SUN, as around a hub of fire, the planets revolve like a dark wheel. Even so, around the center which is God, the worlds and the creatures revolve like the many spokes of the wheel which is the universe. This is the fact and truth to which Christmas recalls our straying minds and errant souls, as it shows us again a manger where a newborn child becomes the hub of time, dividing history into a Before and After. Thus Christmas each year turns us from the surface which men call "living" to the center which is life.

That is the reason why Christmas — or rather men's judgment of Christmas — is the most drastic of questions. Do we smile at Christmas, indulgently or scornfully, as at a sunlit gleam of illusion upon the surface of a soap-bubble? Or do we see Christmas as the Seed of Eternity become the center of time? In that choice of simple profound alternatives, we enlist in either one or two opposite uncompromising armies of the spirit; and our choice determines all lesser things — from the politics of time to the politics of Eternity, from the bread we eat to the stars we follow.

On one side of that choice lie the gas ovens of Dachau and the "corrective" labor

camps of Siberia; on the other, the music of Johann Sebastian Bach and the cathedral of Chartres. On one side lies the crackling nihilism of Jean Paul Sartre; on the other the glory of G. K. Chesterton's "Ballad of the White Horse." One choice leads to the thin humanism of Bernard Shaw; the other to the rich humanity of Charles Dickens. On one side lies the restless flicker of successive frustrations and futilities called Picasso; on the other, the noble pilgrimage of the soul that is El Greco.

Thus the war of the spirit, which is always the essential drama of history, is brought to crisis in Christmas. For Christmas is the great symbol and poem which affirms that life is a time-surface that is given timeless meaning because it has a center that is eternal.

The one essential war that underlies all significant but fragmentary wars, and which is the soul of the tremendous struggle of good and evil that fractures our whole world today, is the war between those who see life only as a surface and those who see life rather as a center by which the surface lives. Out of that metaphysical conflict all physical conflicts come. Out of that spiritual fact all "practical" facts follow.

Those who believe only in the surface seek naturally to seize and dominate the time-film, so they set all our goals and satisfactions upon its transient flicker (soon, they believe, to wink out into a scanty residue of sour suds); but those who believe in the living center, reverence and serve and *preserve* the surface in terms of meaning and value, and so make even the time-film the stage of a drama of life everlasting. This is the truth which Christmas turns into outward and visible reality, as it shows us God, the center, entering the temporal surface to give it eternal life.

ALL GENUINE conservatism is rooted in the dynamic, creative, living *center*. For it is only in the abiding center (which is never a status quo but a dynamo of creation) that two plus two are four; that, as a man sows, so shall he also reap; that each man's uncommon fingerprints proclaim that no man is ever "common;" that the colors of the spectrum, unaged by all the decades and the centuries, maintain forever their firm glory of individual unfading hues. Because of the absolute unchanging center, Truth is not (as relativists believe) just "the most convenient lie," but eternal harmony with the changeless constitution of reality. Beauty is never the mercurial whim of the hour's fashion, but the living rhythm by which the universe moves into the dainty geometry of the snowflake or the delicate patterns of Mozart. Right is never the "they

say!" of manners or the might of the big battalions, but the ordered justice that holds the stars in their courses and the hero in his honor.

All that is wrong with the world today, from the shoddy smartness and night of Existentialism to the shabby violence and spite of Communism — from the drab relativism of John Dewey to the crass opportunism of financiers who shout for business-as-usual with Mao Tse-tung — from the celluloid soul of Hollywood to the amoeba-gropings of "The Death of a Salesman" — comes from our idolatry of the surface, our ignorance of the center.

It was so in Bethlehem, those many years ago. On the time-film of the world the seemingly "important" things bulked huge: Caesar, the legions, the bread and circuses; the sophisticates of the world, feeding on nightingales' tongues, curling their hair, seeking the perversities of perfumed boys; the commoners, shouting for free grain from Africa and turning thumbs down on the dying gladiator; the outward pomp and circumstance like a thin veil over the inward nihilism.

But these were the illusions of the time-film: reality lay in the center which is Eternity, that was quietly invading the world while the brown-eyed ox and curly sheep stared from deep shallow eyes, munching their hay (and never asking that it be buttered); and fire leaped naked on

stone; and a mother who had borne a child nine months beneath her heart now rejoiced in the pain of travail; and where God, made man, drew into His lungs the air that is our human antidote to death. The imposing surface of man's works and ways had severed its roots into the center; it was already a dying tree, whose sap had ceased to flow, whose leaf was hectic with death.

But the quiet, living, secret center was about to proclaim again, "Lo, I make all things new!", and to raise the world (while it kept its roots in the center) toward the upward Niagaras of stone that are Chartres and Rouen, and toward the grandeur that is Michelangelo and the glory that is Shakespeare.

ALWAYS IT IS SO! The great, fruitful, creative areas of history are those where the surface is lifted into life because men have their roots in the center. The primal, the elemental, the first Eden that is the last Apocalypse, the *I Am* of God's Eternal Now, the Word that *is* before birth and after death; these are the Fiery Core, the Eternal Seed, the timeless Creator of all time's creatures. On the surface of the world, man seems an accident that happened to an amoeba; from the center of reality man is only a little lower than the angels. Thus we can be human only if humanism is false; we can be as gods only if we live in God. Our lives on the surface exist only because God, at the

center, *is*: God from whom the rainbows stream like a drift of peacocks' feathers, and the spectrum-fountain of the flowers pours, and the rain falls upon a thirsty land, and the young lions find their food.

Simple, inexorable, real, that center will never let the mind-proud perversities of the time-film ever quite destroy the surface by concentrating on the surface: when things grow worse, He comes in miracle and might — a new invasion of time by Eternity — and God is born upon the straw of a manger to shake Caesar from the pomp and purple of the throne. "Civilization" that, in its proud sophistication, has reduced man to barren dust, is renewed by God till it realizes once more that all dust is stardust, and so can, once more, itself give birth to a dancing star.

So today, as always in the unchanging centuries, into our shallow and sterile idolatry on the surface, Christmas comes to restore us to the center. It comes like a strong free wind into a mortician's stuffy parlor. In our parlor of the dead, the undertakers who are called "artists," or "philosophers," or "politicians," have laid us out like corpses and stiffened our blood with embalming fluid. But God invades His world again — and even we dead awaken. Into the time-film — the sophistication, the manners and techniques, the many inventions, "the straw-men, the hollow men, leaning together" — comes the earthquake and tidal wave of God . . . yet they come

as gently as the dew falls or the dimpled rose opens. And we live again, like Lazarus from the tomb, or like Saul on the road to Damascus.

COLLECTIVISM is the most resolutely complete of all man's attempts to cut his roots to the center and to live wholly on the surface. It is the proudest foray of Lucifer and the Wrecked Angels to reduce the living center of God to the secular surface of man. It would sever our roots forever; it would proclaim the world a soap-bubble; it would hijack man into the surface heaven of a perpetual soup-kitchen. It can afflict us with mischief and misery for a long time, but in the end it will fail because it contradicts the stars in their courses and the rose in the root.

Only the conservative has a future for only the conservative has a center. Why is every spring new? — because the rose that blossoms on the surface recurrently is blooming changelessly forever within the center. As Angelus Silesius says:

The rose that here thy mortal eye doth see,

It so hath bloomed in God from all Eternity.

And at Christmas we realize this truth more poignantly; we see the eternal things that are real and abide — the frost and the fire; the good simple beasts; the anguish in the mother's flesh and the joy in the mother's

heart; the child that (even God!) comes always in the ancient, ever-new way; the stars that hold the earth in a cage of beauty.

And one thing more! — a thing of awe and beatitude. Christmas came to a world made sterile and dying because the isolationists of the surface had broken contact with the living center. Our contemporary world also, in its pride and perversity, in the blatant ignorance that it boasts of as sophistication, has even more terribly isolated itself from the center. Christmas shows us, in poem and symbol, that once at the moment of the worst there came the glory of the best. In the light of that fact, let us watch and pray in our fallen, decadent world: for perhaps even now the great Word is about to go forth again, and once more in literal fact the ever-living Christ is about to enter His world, secret and unknown, to reveal to us, face to face, the dreadful and holy presence of the center that is God.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: 6 for \$1; 10 for \$1.50; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10; 500 for \$20; 1,000 for \$30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, \$20 per thousand.

E. Merrill Root is Professor of English at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, and the author of six books of poetry. His most recent book is *Collectivism on the Campus*, published this year by Devin-Adair and available from HUMAN EVENTS for \$5.00 per copy.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for \$1.